

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 3, which, as a result, has been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that the application is allowable in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Document No. JP2000107116 to Kiyoyasu (hereinafter "Kiyoyasu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,064,887 to Geiger *et al.* (hereinafter "Geiger") and U.S. Patent No. 6,596,232 to Lin *et al.* (hereinafter "Lin"). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The combination of Kiyoyasu, Geiger and Lin fails to disclose every feature of the present invention claimed in amended claim 1. Specifically, the combination of Kiyoyasu, Geiger and Lin fails to teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious a second spray arm having a plane of rotation that partly extends underneath that of the first spray arm (20), which essentially extends coaxially with the sump hopper (23) according to claim 1.

The combined teachings of Kiyoyasu and Geiger are cited in the discussion of claim 3 in the Office action as rendering this claimed combination obvious. However, Kiyoyasu fails to teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the claimed coaxial alignment of the first spray arm with the sump hopper. Kiyoyasu also fails to teach, suggest or render obvious an angled orientation of a spray arm. Even if the first spray arm in Geiger is coaxially aligned with the sump hopper, the angled spray arm in Geiger is the *upper* spray arm, which is suspended from the upper rack in the dishwasher of Geiger. In fact, the upper, angled spray arm in Geiger cited in combination with the teachings of Kiyoyasu is separated from the lower spray arm by the lower rack of the dishwasher. It would therefore be physically impossible for the plane of

rotation of the angled spray arm in Geiger, alone or considered in any combination with Kiyoyasu and/or Lin to partly extend underneath that of the first spray arm.

Further with regard to claim 1, the combination of Kiyoyasu, Geiger and Lin fails to teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious a dishwasher including first and second spray arms disposed vertically beneath a rack adjacent to the sloped panel, wherein the first spray arm extends coaxially with the sump hopper and the second spray arm is positioned above the sloped panel with its axis of rotation extending at a right angle to said panel as claimed in amended claim 1. The only angled spray arms disclosed by the combination of references are the spray arm suspended above the lower rack in Geiger, and the multiple angled spray arms in Lin, which fails to disclose any rack.

Further, applicants respectfully submit that the invention of claim 1 would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the combination of Kiyoyasu, Geiger and Lin. On the contrary, the combined teachings of Kiyoyasu, Geiger and Lin teach away from the claimed invention. Angling the second spray arm as taught by Geiger instead of as claimed would prevent a plane of rotation of the second spray arm from partly extending underneath that of the first spray arm. The bottom rack of Geiger disposed between the two spray arms makes the claimed plane of rotation of the second spray arm partly extending underneath that of the first spray arm impossible. Accordingly, claim 1 as amended herein would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the combined teachings of Kiyoyasu, Geiger and Lin.

For at least the above reasons, the combination of Kiyoyasu, Geiger and Lin does not render claim 1 obvious, and thus, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. The remaining claims in the present application, namely, claims 2 and 4-6, are allowable for the limitations therein and for the limitations of the claims from which they depend.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is

Appl. No. 10/525,627
Amdt. Dated May 14, 2008
Reply to Office action of February 14, 2008

PATENT AF
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
ART UNIT: 1792

determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. AEG-37595.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: /donald j. firca, jr./
Donald J. Firca, Jr., Reg. No. 48,140

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

May 14, 2008